

From: (b) (6)
To: "Cerise, Kathy" <Cerise.Kathryn@epa.gov>
Date: 10/8/2019 6:53:34 AM
Subject: response to proposed Port Quendall

I have reviewed the proposed docs. provided with the meeting notice concerning Port Quendall.

My opinion is the contamination is pervasive, extensive and not suitable for the EPA Alt 7 to burn in place, etc. Smoldering contributes polluting emissions to the surrounding community for long term to achieve the needed elimination of the contaminates. Why add this method of pollution to the population of many homes and commercial sites or anywhere? Isn't that the same as a burning waste dump?

Offsite treatment of these soils is quicker method of removing contaminates. Of course, it is more costly and disruptive to the neighboring community but the future proposal for development of the same land is even more so. All contaminants in this section of land and water should be removed completely for the next generations of people to use safely and should be the goal of this government agency.

The contamination to soils, ground water and drainage is a major concern to short term remediation (5 years) of this designated land. I believe Alternatives 8-10 would result in the aggressive clean up necessary for such deep and long term existing contamination. Even then the results may not eliminate decades of embedded chemicals of all sorts. A 100 yr monitoring of this land would be appropriate without structures. However the resulting development previously presented to the community wouldn't allow for remediation if needed because all land surface would be utilized. The buildings would require considerable depth for foundations thereby disturbing the suggested capping methods and the underground contamination could still pollute by exposure and seepage.

I am of the opinion removing all soils on land and in the lake bed are the best avenues to restore these ground soils to acceptable clean levels for human usage.

(b) (6)
Renton Wa 98056
(b) (6)